

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6 and 8-20 are pending and rejected in the Application. No claims have been amended.

On page 2, the Official Action rejects claims 1, 3, 5-6 and 9-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Murphy (U.S. Patent No. 6,282,362) in view of Ueda (U.S. Patent No. 7,061,982). It is respectfully submitted, however, that the claims are patentable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth below.

Applicants' invention, as recited by claim 1, includes features which are neither disclosed nor suggested by the art of record, namely:

wherein a data storage format of the parameter information file is such that all parameter information in the parameter information file associated with one type of data is stored sequential to all parameter information in the parameter information file associated with another type of data by using a classification according to a type of data.

Claim 1 relates to a parameter information file. Specifically, the parameter information file is broken down into classifications. Thus, all the parameter information associated with one type of data is stored sequential to all the parameter information associated with the another type of data. This feature is supported on pages 13-17 of the originally filed application and furthermore shown in Fig. 2.

On page 3, the Official Action states that Col. 10, lines 14-25, Col. 14, line 40-Col. 15, line 10, Fig. 7 and Figs. 21-22 of Ueda suggests the "*wherein clause*" in claim 2. Applicants, however, respectfully disagree. In Fig. 7, Ueda suggests a stream that comprises a plurality of packs. Each of the packs within the stream comprise various video and audio packets. In Col. 14, lines 50-55, Ueda suggests that only the video packets may be sequenced out of the stream "*sequencing only the video codes taken out of the video packets makes a series of video sequences*". In Col. 15, lines 1-10, Ueda also suggest that only the audio packets are sequenced from the stream. Thus, Ueda is able to sequence out only the video packets or only the audio packets from the stream. Ueda, however, does not disclose or suggest storing all of the parameter information of the video packets sequentially to all of the parameter information

of the audio packets. Thus, Ueda does not disclose the data storage format as currently recited in claim 1.

Applicants' claim 1 is different than Ueda because of a data storage format of a parameter information file. Specifically, the data storage format is such that all the parameter information associated with one type of data is stored sequential to all of the parameter information associated with another type data (*"wherein a data storage format of the parameter information file is such that all parameter information in the parameter information file associated with one type of data is stored sequential to all parameter information in the parameter information file associated with another type of data by using a classification according to a type of data"*). For example, the format of the parameter information file is at least shown in Applicants' Fig. 2 which includes a header portion, audio file portion, image file portion and video file portion. All of the parameter information associated with the audio file 41 stored sequentially to all of the parameter information for the image file 42. This sequential storage for the different types of data is at least shown as 41, 42 and 43 in Applicants' Fig. 2. This feature is also supported on pages 13-17 of Applicants' specification (*"the audio file portion 41 ... the image file portion 42 ... the video file portion 43"*). Thus, as shown in Applicants' Fig. 2, the parameter information associated with the audio type of data is stored sequentially to the parameter information of the image type of data which is stored sequentially to the parameter information of the video type of data (41 is stored sequential to 42 which is stored sequential to 43). Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above, claim 1 is patentable over the art of record.

Claims 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 have features similar to claim 1. Thus, these claims are also patentable over the art of record for at least the reason set forth above.

Dependent claims 3, 5, 6 and 15-20 include all of the features of the claims from which they depend. Thus, these claims are also patentable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above.

On page 5, the Official Action rejects claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murphy in view of Ueda and further in view of Ohnuma. Neither Murphy, Ueda, Ohnuma nor their combinations suggest the features in Applicants' claim 1. Thus, the combination of Murphy, Ueda and Ohnuma is deficient.


Dependent claim 8 includes all of the features of claim 1 from which it depends. Thus, claim 8 is also patentable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above.

Application No.: 10/725,929
Amendment Dated August 21, 2009
Reply to Office Action of May 22, 2009

MTS-3580US

In view of the arguments set forth above, the above-identified application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Jacques L. Etkowicz, Reg. No. 41,738
Attorney for Applicants

JLE/nm

Dated: August 21, 2009

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

SO_450272